

**General Plan 2020**  
**Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**November 5, 2001**  
*Revised November 19, 2001*  
*Revised December 3, 2001*

---

**Interest Group Committee:**

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins/Chris Anderson	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

**Public at Large:**

Barbara Lind	Jamul
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Carolina Gregor	SANDAG
Constance Clover	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Janet Anderson	Sierra Club/SDNHM
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Julie Bugbee	Lakeside
Lael Montgomery	Valley Center
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Paul Gebert	SDCWA
Ruth Potter	LWVSD Co

**County Staff:**

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)  
Gary Pryor (DPLU)  
Ivan Holler (DPLU)  
Tim Popejoy (DPLU)  
Michelle Yip (DPLU)  
Sam Teres (DPLU)  
Tom Harron (County Counsel)  
Jonathan Smulian (WRT Consultant)

## **Agenda Item II: Logistics –**

- a) Minutes for October 22, 2001
  - Pryde stated that he did not receive the minutes in time for review. Minutes will be approved at the next meeting on November 19<sup>th</sup>.
  - Bowlby asked for a clarification on the SPA Evaluation (pp. 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet). Bowlby asked if most SPAs would fit into this category with the assumption that SPAs usually go for five years. Holler responded that most SPAs are old and approaching expiration date, but could not say specifically how many there are in that category. Pryor stated that SPAs do not inherently have time limits unless there is one specifically built into the conditions of approval for the SPA.
- b) East County Field Trip Update
  - The field trip to Spring Valley, Valle de Oro, Jamul/Dulzura, Tecate, Potrero, Lake Morena/Campo, Pine Valley, Descanso and Alpine took place on October 29<sup>th</sup> and almost every community planning area had a chair represented on the trip. This field trip, with the previous central and northern field trips, should have covered most of the unincorporated County.

## **Agenda Item III: Draft Regional Categories –**

- Scarborough stated that her understanding of the definition of a “regional category” is broad categories at a regional level. Some General Plans do not include regional categories and go straight to designators. The San Diego County General Plan has both regional categories and designators. Under the existing General Plan, designators are tied to specific densities with corresponding lot sizes. Under GP2020, we are proposing to separate these two things. GP2020 designators (i.e., commercial, residential, industrial) are not tied to specific densities. Currently, the draft regional categories are tied with corresponding density ranges. Through the natural progression of the GP2020 process, the draft regional categories and the structure map will evolve into a more detailed draft land use designation map. We need to refine our direction to staff so that the draft regional categories match the proposed densities that will ultimately match the draft designators. Pryor added that regional categories are not necessary to a general plan, however, designations (i.e., commercial, residential, industrial) are. Such designations usually have a range of densities associated with them. The categories under the existing General Plan (i.e., Country Town, CUDA, FUDA, etc.) do not have to be reproduced in GP2020. We have retained the concept of regional categories (i.e., Village Core, Semi Rural Estates, etc.) because everybody is familiar with the concept. It is important to keep in mind that these are optional and used for descriptive purposes only. Underneath these draft regional categories will be the designations (i.e., commercial, residential, industrial). We can say that a “Village Core” is comprised of a mix of commercial, residential and industrial, but then the designators set the density.
- Bowlby stated that the “Future Development” regional category is still under debate with the Sierra Club. He asked if there were any designators that pertained to environmentally sensitive areas. Pryor responded that the use of a designator such as “environmentally constrained” is not required. Most environmental controls are implemented with separate ordinances such as RPO. RPO applies to all residential, commercial and industrial lands. When the existing General Plan was created, implementing ordinances such as RPO and BMO did not yet exist. Therefore, the only way to determine the location of environmentally constrained areas was to put them on a map; nevertheless, not all potentially environmentally constrained areas were identified through this process. Now, RPO and BMO apply to every piece of property in the County, so every developer has to ensure compliance with the applicable implementing ordinance. These are much more specific than an “environmentally constrained” category.
- Whalen stated that minimum lot size is being decoupled from this process. He then stated that he had been attending various community meetings to see what the communities would and would not like in terms of densification. He reported that most East County communities are opposed to the concept of “apartments.” On the other hand, most East County communities are amenable to the concept of single family detached units on small lots if done well. Based on this, he finds the density

range for Village Core and Village Core Support acceptable. It is possible to build single family detached dwelling units at a density of 12-14 du/ac within the context of a community's character.

- Holler identified a typing error in the density range for Semi-Rural Estates. Instead of 1 du/ac—1 du/4 ac, it should read 1 du/ac—1 du/10 ac.
- Whalen stated that the incorporated cities are opposed to densification and so we should not rely on them as a solution. Therefore, perhaps the intensification of the density potential in Semi-Rural Estates would be desired. He proposed a range of 3 du/ac—1 du/10 ac. For Future Development, Whalen proposed the creation of another master-planned community location as a way of accepting density—perhaps in North County because of Temecula, perhaps in the vicinity of a casino because of the infrastructure that will have to be in place there anyway. Whalen approved of the density ranges for Rural Lands.
- Pryde stated that he foresees Future Development areas as places that would be used for receiving areas. Pryde also mentioned that although it had not yet been deleted, the group had decided to remove the “East of CWA” density range for Village Core, because there are no such areas east of the CWA line. He then asked for clarification as to whether the group adopted the descriptions when they adopted the draft Regional Categories. Silver stated that his motion was to adopt the nomenclature only. Scarborough reaffirmed that only the nomenclature has been adopted by the Interest Group, not the summary/description. Pryor responded that staff is endeavoring to craft descriptions that will fit with the nomenclature that will follow with regard to the commercial, residential and industrial designations.
- Silver stated that Village Core should have the potential for multi-family development. Pryor stated that the density ranges for the draft regional categories only specify how many potential dwelling units per acre can be developed; the zoning ordinance will be the implementing document that will specify whether or not multi-family development is permitted. These types of regulatory issues will follow after we have settled the land use distribution question.
- Silver stated that underutilized land with existing infrastructure in place should be used more efficiently as a way of accommodating growth. Therefore, he does not object to a density range of 3 du/ac—1 du/10 ac in Semi-Rural, if it means that land will be used more efficiently. Silver mentioned the notion of promoting a “European-style” countryside with empty rural spaces and concentrated villages. He also stated that he would like to create a clean break between town and country in the more heavily populated areas like Ramona, Alpine, Valley Center, etc. For this reason, Silver proposed retaining the 1 du/40 ac density west of the CWA line and the 1 du/80 and 160 ac density east of the CWA line. He said that the green is far too parcelized already. Therefore, he can support increasing densities in the yellow if it allows us to do the right thing in the green. Silver also proposed the creation of agricultural parcels for agricultural purposes in the Semi-Rural Estates with no dwelling units associated with them. In such areas the subdivision of ten or twenty acre parcels would be permitted for agricultural purposes.
- Stedt proposed a different graphic representation for public vs. private inholdings within national forest and state park lands. He said that this process needs to incorporate groundtruthing in order to understand what our current needs are to provide for contiguous wild lands and housing. Scarborough stated that her understanding of the groundtruthing issue is that we are trying to determine what currently exists, from a market perspective, and then determine what we are planning for. Pryor stated that staff is currently in the process of creating a map that shows all the areas where the County has no land use jurisdiction, such as state parks, national forest, Indian reservations, etc.—and these lands will be clearly identified as separate from Rural Lands.
- Barker stated that Rural Lands seems to encompass a wide spectrum of potential land uses, where one person may interpret the range and think that land is developable at 1 du/10 ac, whereas another may think that land is constrained. Barker asked the group if they could see any value in separating the category out to specify where land is not developable.
- Bowlby stated that you cannot say that a pre-existing, legal parcel is not developable; however, you can say that no further subdivisions are permitted. Added that he would like to have Silver's proposed density range for Semi-Rural (3 du/ac—1 du/10 ac) defined more specifically to prevent the possibility of having a density of 3 du/ac throughout the whole Semi-Rural area. Pryor stated that the proposed density range for Semi-Rural will not be applied so that it constantly shifts from the low end to the high end throughout the whole area; rather, specific densities within this range will be applied to specific areas in the Semi-Rural category. Scarborough added that the next iteration of the map will show these kinds of specifics, so that there will be no “guessing game” and the group will have further ability to redirect.

- Bowlby stated that he believes that the area is too large for semi-rural residential development, but he concurs with the rural proposal. Bowlby then asked Pryor for the number of private inholdings within the Cleveland National Forest overlay. Pryor replied that staff would get that information to him. He added that FCI has set a density for these parcels at 1 du/40 ac and that there is no proposal to change this in GP2020, because the density set by FCI is effective for another eight or ten years. Therefore, this density will not change unless a privately initiated GPA is proposed to change this density after FCI is no longer effective.
- Pryde stated that a density of 7.3 du/ac, if applied to single-family detached dwelling units, represents 6,000 square foot lots, approximately 100 ft X 60 ft.
- Messer stated that she appreciates the discussion about habitat lands and that she is concerned about the question of how to connect habitat lands where the County has jurisdiction. She said that she could not support 20 and 40 in the East County; she would prefer 80 and 160. Pryor asked if the goal is to limit the number of houses or to limit further subdivision that might be used for housing. He stated that there are reasons to divide land besides for development purposes, and that it is important not to preclude those other possibilities. He stated that the goal of the Interest Group, as he sees it, is to on one hand protect fragile lands and habitat, and on the other ensure that there is sufficient land available to accommodate future growth within the current market. He stated these densities have to be viewed as “rooftops” rather than “parcel sizes.” A hundred acre plot of land could accommodate ten dwelling units at a density of 1 du/10 ac. If they can be placed together on ten or fifteen acres, as opposed to spreading all ten of them over the whole hundred acres, then growth can be accommodated while protecting open space. Pryde stated that he is not necessarily counting “rooftops,” he is counting impact in terms of lights, off-road vehicles, etc.
- Higgins stated that she would like to look at where to put housing, not just where to constrain it. She is concerned that the Interest Group is not being realistic in assessing what the communities really want to do. She believes it would be more beneficial to first look at how much land we need in order to accommodate housing so that we would then know how much is left over to protect from further development. Scarborough stated that the meetings have been balanced in terms of discussing how to transfer development from the “backcountry” to the “frontcountry.”
- Stehly stated that the Farm Bureau is concerned about there being sufficient small farms. Farming cannot go east of the CWA line and the majority of farms are under ten acres. Therefore, the Farm Bureau would like to see a density of 10 acres applied west of the CWA line. Stehly said that farming has been successful in San Diego County because no regulatory agency has dictated where farming should go. He stated that in other California counties where this has happened, it has had a detrimental effect on farming. He said that he would like the flexibility of having farming in Semi-Rural or Rural, or even to have small farms in Village Core areas. East of the CWA line, the Farm Bureau can support 40, 80 and 160.
- Silver stated that we cannot retain 1/40 or 1/20-type densities in the East County, cluster them, and retain the value. If there is density, it must remain at 1/80, 1/160 east of the CWA line. These could be clustered, but both rooftops and impacts must be limited. He stated that he does not believe that clustering works east of the CWA line, however, he sees the yellow area as an appropriate area for clustering. Semi-Rural is an appropriate place for ½ acre and 1 acre farms. He stated that there are enough legal parcels in the green already, so those areas should have a density of 1/40. Subdivision could be permitted for agricultural purposes.
- Scarborough requested that somebody make a motion regarding Village Core and Village since there seemed to be general consensus on these two categories, with the qualification that the “East of CWA” provisions under Village Core have been deleted. Pryde expressed concern that the concept of a “village” seems to mean two different things east and west of the CWA line. He added that “village” will be defined by the uses and densities that will be associated with it.
- Adams expressed concern that the Interest Group is continuing to reduce the amount of land that is available for growth by eliminating Village Core from east of the CWA line. Scarborough stated that, according to her notes, on October 8<sup>th</sup>, Pryde made a motion to take “Core” out of concept D, and the Interest Group approved unanimously.
- Elias asked for further clarification regarding the order of magnitude for the various density ranges. Pryor reiterated the two directives that the Interest Group has given to staff: 1) protect the environment and 2) ensure that we can accommodate future population while staying within current market structures. The issue is to satisfy these two major concerns. However, staff must first have direction regarding the density ranges before the potential impacts of that can be assessed.

- Barker stated that she believes that the map is still reflecting the *status quo*. She stated that densities should be increased in the Village Core and Village areas as a way of accommodating growth. This is a far more effective method than increasing densities in Semi-Rural.
- Whalen pointed out that there are five or six areas depicted on the map as Village Core, and he wondered if those areas are currently at that density. He supports the idea of neither reducing nor raising the densities that are in these areas today. There are a lot of small lots in the green already, so if we do not want these built on, there needs to be some incentive to split up the big lot sizes vs. the smaller lots sizes to facilitate the transaction to occur.
- Bowlby stated that he would be willing to expand Village west of the CWA line to accommodate projected growth, as long as the growth does not exceed the unincorporated County's historical share of the regional population (i.e., 13-17%). He is prepared to make a motion on the regional categories, with the caveat that the Interest Group still has to figure out a way to delineate Semi-Rural Estates. Silver reiterated that these densities are quantitatively defined as dwelling units per acre, not as lot sizes, that these density ranges are not to be applied uniformly within each color, and that the structure map is not a final map.
- **Motion:** Silver moved to approve the draft Regional Categories with the following density ranges: Village Core, only west of the CWA line with a range of 7.3 du/ac—29 du/ac; no change to Village; Semi-Rural is modified to include a range of 2 du/ac—1 du/10 ac; Rural, west of the CWA line would be 1 du/40 ac, with agricultural parcels of 10 and 20 acres (no dwelling units permitted on the agricultural parcels), east of the CWA line would include a density range of 1 du/80 ac—1 du/160 ac with agricultural parcels of 40 acres; Future Development would be retained as a place holder. Elias seconded the motion.
- **Amendment:** Stedt stated that he cannot support the motion as he believes there is still an underlying issue of respecting the value. Silver amended his motion to reflect that the implementation of this motion is contingent upon the development of a workable system that protects land values.
- Stedt would like to see the motion include a Village Core area that would reflect the existing development of Village Core areas east of the CWA line, and not simply eliminate that as one of the categories. He stated that he would prefer a high end density of 3 du/ac in the Semi-Rural category, that such an overlap in the allowable densities of Village and Semi-Rural would assist in working between the two categories. Stedt stated that he would like to see the concept of a TDR program for the Rural Lands category incorporated into the motion, by identifying which densities would be preferred for transferring out.
- Bowlby stated that he cannot support the motion because it does not define Semi-Rural Estate areas.
- Pryde does not support 2 du/ac and would prefer to retain the high end of the range at 1 du/ac. He would also like to see Village areas east of the CWA line have a density range of 1 du/ac—4.3 du/ac.
- Whalen stated that he would only be willing to support the motion if the Semi-Rural category was modified to include 3 du/ac. He would also support the original proposal of Village areas east of the CWA line having a density range of 2 du/ac—4.3 du/ac, pending the results of groundtruthing to see what the existing patterns are. Silver stated that he can support the amendment to his motion. Elias accepted the amendment to the motion.
- **Amendment:** Scarborough announced that the motion has been amended for Semi-Rural to include a density of 3 du/ac, pending groundtruthing.
- Tabb stated that he supports Silver's motion, subject to Whalen's modification. He referenced Stedt's input regarding the TDRs – if a person wishes to develop their land, then these numbers apply; but if a person wishes to transfer the density for that land, then the lower numbers apply. Pryor stated that he cannot direct staff to develop a TDR program until the group can answer the question of where growth will go and where growth will be limited.
- Pryde stated that he was not satisfied with the 3 du/ac and asked Whalen if he would accept a qualifier that it applies to existing development. Whalen replied that he would not accept that modification.
- Pryde asked Silver and Elias if they would be willing to modify the motion to apply to all categories except Semi-Rural. Silver preferred settling the issue with regard to Semi-Rural now.
- Adams requested clarification that the Interest Group is not seeking to remove value, and then implement a TDR program based on the new value; rather, the Group is seeking to retain the value. Pryor stated that the value of the parcel is set by the buildable yield of the parcel, which is determined by applying RPO and BMO to the parcel. The existing value of the parcel, based on RPO and BMO, is part of the equation in a TDR program.

- Stehly stated that the Farm Bureau does not support this motion, and he took exception to the part of the motion that would not allow dwelling units on agricultural parcels. Silver responded that his motion is not proposing to take away the right to build a house on an existing legal parcel, and that it is concerned with the question of further subdividing those existing legal parcels. Any value that would be lost would be captured through the TDR program. Stehly stated that most farmers simply want to live on the land that they farm. Messer expressed her disappointment that the provision allowing for agricultural parcels in the motion did not satisfy the Farm Bureau.
- Stedt agreed with Stehly, that it is difficult to effectively have a farm that you cannot live on to operate. He then reiterated that a TDR program is the best mechanism to protect land values and stated that by not dealing with a TDR program today, the group is seeking to first take away land value and then preserve it. Pryor replied that nothing is being taken away today; rather, densities are being proposed so that the potential impacts can be tested in order to see how growth can reasonably be accommodated while stopping the sprawl that San Diego County is faced with. Once we determine where we want development to go and where we do not want it to go, that becomes the basis for a TDR program. There is no drop in value at this point.
- Stedt stated that the underlying issue of this motion, as he sees it, is the retention of the environmental and ownership values existing today. He maintains that Silver's motion does not accomplish this.
- Gendron stated that she would prefer to see densities increase in the Village areas, rather than in the Semi-Rural.
- Adams proposed that in order to accommodate the farmers, perhaps the acreage of agricultural parcels could be increased and farmers would be permitted to build a dwelling unit on it. Barker noted that there are no restrictions being proposed that would not allow agriculture to occur within Semi-Rural as a land use.
- **Amendment:** Silver amended his motion to reach an accommodation: within Rural, west of the CWA line would include a density range of 1 du/20 ac—1 du/40 ac, and agriculture-only parcels of 10 and 20 acres would be permitted. No change east of the CWA line.
- Bowlby stated that any density between 3 du/ac—1 du/10 ac should be incorporated into a more compact development that is either an expansion of the Village or within the Village. A large part of Semi-Rural should take on a 10 and 20 acre minimum parcel size to accommodate agriculture. Plenty of subdivision already exists in those areas west of the CWA line. Scarborough stated that this issue probably fits best as part of a discussion on the Village Limit Line that will take place at a later date, but is not a part of the motion currently on the table.
- Pryde stated that he will vote against the motion because he cannot support the 3 du/ac in Semi-Rural Estates, because this would allow for denser development in Semi-Rural than is permitted in the Village (2 du/ac). Messer offered that perhaps the same qualification can be applied to this "upzone" as has been applied to the "downzone" – that it is contingent upon an acceptable TDR/PDR program. This is part of an overall mechanism for preserving the East County.
- Stehly conceded to the amendment regarding the density range in Rural, west of the CWA line. He then offered the following proposed amendment to the density range in Rural, east of the CWA line: 20% of the parcels would be placed in 1 du/40 ac, and the remaining 80% would be placed in the 1 du/80 ac—1 du/160 ac range. Stedt stated that he would be closer to supporting this motion if it included Stehly's amendment.
- Pryde asked if it would be legal to include a qualification in the zoning that would allow parcels in Rural, east of the CWA line, to have a density of 1 du/40 ac only if the owners of the subject parcel(s) applied for Williamson Act status. Scarborough clarified Pryde's statement by stating that the intent of his proposal would be to ensure that such parcels would continue to be operated as farms. Silver stated that property owners are able to remove their parcel(s) from Williamson Act status any time they want, they only have to pay a penalty. Stehly stated that he could agree with Pryde's compromise.
- Pryde stated that his proposal is meant to act as a "safety valve" to prevent someone from subdividing a parcel without the intent of conducting agriculture, and to prevent "frivolous" lot splits. Silver stated that he sees no justifiable reason to add "roof tops" east of the CWA line. Holler responded that there are contracts that can be terminated early, subject to a penalty. He said that Pryde's proposal might entail an amendment to State law, and that staff would have to look into the issue further.
- Silver stated that he would be willing to consider Stehly's proposal, but he expressed trepidation over what it could look like on the ground.

- Elias stated that the idea behind the 80 and 160 is about being serious when it comes to preserving land. She then stated that the average size of most agricultural parcels is 10 acres or less, and they have to have water; therefore, she believes it is perfectly appropriate to restrict it in the backcountry, east of the CWA line.
- Messer stated that she might be willing to concede to 10% or 15%, if we can get to the gap analysis and habitat values in a timely fashion. She stated that she would like to see groundtruthing for habitat values—she said that has to come into play very soon so we can see the effect.
- Silver asked for a clarification: 15% of new parcels or 15% of the acres. Stehly specified it at 20% of the acres. Messer and Silver added that this would have to be contingent on the percentage demonstrating that it is in an acceptable location in terms of aesthetics, wildlife, etc. Holler replied that Messer and Silver's comments entailed an acceptable proviso, giving staff a little flexibility in creating a product that is more representative of the competing interests seated at the table.
- **Amendment:** Silver amended his motion to include Stehly's proposal for 20% of the acreage in Rural, east of the CWA line, to be placed in a density of 1 du/40 ac, provided it can be demonstrated that this percentage will be in an acceptable location. Elias withdrew her second to the motion. Adams seconded the motion. Stehly stated that he supports this motion.
- **Amendment:** Pryde requested clarification regarding parcels in Semi-Rural east of the CWA line: there is no density specified for them, only the language "existing development only," therefore, existing parcels will be grandfathered in. Silver altered the language to read: "Existing parcels only."
- ❖ **Revision made at the November 19, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting on the following motion and vote:**  
**Vote:** Approve the draft Regional Categories with the following densities, contingent upon a workable system ~~that protects land values~~ of TDRs or other mechanisms agreed upon ( \* ): Village Core, only located west of CWA, would have a density range of 7.3 du/ac—29 du/ac; no change to Village; Semi-Rural, west of CWA, would have a density range of 1 du/10 ac—3 du/ac, pending groundtruthing, east of CWA, existing parcels only; Rural, west of CWA, would have a density range of 1 du/20 ac—1 du/40 ac, with agricultural parcels of 10 and 20 acres (no dwelling units), east of CWA, no more than 20% of the acreage would have a density of 1 du/40 ac, provided it can be demonstrated that such acreage is in an acceptable location, and the remaining 80% of the acreage would have a density range of 1 du/80 ac—1 du/160 ac, with agricultural parcels of 40 acres (no dwelling units); Future Development to be retained as a place holder.
  - ⇒ Favored: 12
  - ⇒ Opposed: 3 2 (Gendron, Doyle, and Bowlby)
  - ⇒ Abstained: 0 1 (Doyle)
- ❖ **Revision made at the December 3, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:** *The motion is to retain its original form as was noted on November 5, 2001 and have amendments noted in the December 3, 2001 minutes. The motion is:* Approve the draft Regional Categories with the following densities, contingent upon a workable system that protects land values: Village Core, only located west of CWA, would have a density range of 7.3 du/ac—29 du/ac; no change to Village; Semi-Rural, west of CWA, would have a density range of 1 du/10 ac—3 du/ac, pending groundtruthing, east of CWA, existing parcels only; Rural, west of CWA, would have a density range of 1 du/20 ac—1 du/40 ac, with agricultural parcels of 10 and 20 acres, east of CWA, 20% of the acreage would have a density of 1 du/40 ac, provided it can be demonstrated that such acreage is in an acceptable location, and the remaining 80% of the acreage would have a density range of 1 du/80 ac—1 du/160 ac, with agricultural parcels of 40 acres; Future Development to be retained as a place holder.

#### **Agenda Item VI: Process –**

- a) Status & Next Steps
  - Scarborough stated that the group will discuss potential sending and receiving areas next time.

#### **Agenda Item VII: Public Comments –**

- Eric Larson brought up the issue of the conflicts in Borrego Springs.

- Dutch Van Dierendonck made a request that staff present this proposal on paper for the next Steering Committee meeting. He then commented that the Interest Group has not yet begun to discuss infrastructure, where jobs will be located, and where the funding will be coming from for all of this.
- A member of the public made a comment regarding fair share housing, that affordable housing usually equates to higher-density multifamily housing, and therefore efforts to provide for affordable housing should be focused in the villages, away from the Semi-Rural areas.